

REMARKS

Claims 33-66 are pending in the application and have been allowed in a Notice of Allowance mailed July 9, 2009. The specification, abstract and Claims 33 and 65 have been amended by this paper. Bases for the amendments may be found throughout the written description, drawings, and claims as originally filed and as such, no new matter has been presented. The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the amendments in view of the remarks contained herein.

AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATION AND ABSTRACT

Applicant has amended the title of the application, the summary and the abstract so that they are consistent with the claims that have been allowed by the Office.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Applicant has proposed amending Claim 33 as follows:

- Line 7: as the limitation “a rotational axis” was introduced in describing rotation of the shaft and the hub in line 5 of the claim, Applicant proposes that reference to “the rotational axis” is proper in line 7 and that it is not necessary that the rotational axis be referenced to the decoupler assembly; and
- Line 25: as the torsion spring and the clutch spring are described in lines 23 and 24 as being disposed in an annular cavity, Applicant submits that it is unnecessary that the torsion spring and the clutch

spring be described for a second time (i.e., in line 25) as being
“disposed in the annular cavity”.

Applicant has proposed amending Claim 65 for similar reasons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the proposed amendments to Claims 33 and 65.

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Applicant gratefully notes the allowance of Claims 33-66 in the present application. Applicant submits that Reasons for Allowance are only warranted in instances in which “the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear [the Examiner’s] reasons for allowing a claim or claims.” 37 C.F.R. 1.104 (e). In the present case, Applicant believes the record as a whole does make clear the reasons for allowance and therefore no statement by the Examiner is necessary or warranted. Furthermore, Applicant does not necessarily agree with each statement in the reasons for allowance. While Applicant believes the claims are allowable, Applicant does not acquiesce that patentability resides solely in the specific feature or combination of features identified, or that each feature or combination of features identified is required for patentability, or that equivalents of any of the recited features are outside the scope of the claims. Moreover, to the extent the Reasons for Allowance do not separately address the subject matter of each claim, Applicant does not acquiesce to any inference that any one claim does not present patentable subject matter independent of any other claim.

CONCLUSION

Prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 31, 2009

/ Michael D. Zalobsky /
By: _____
Michael D. Zalobsky
Reg. No. 45,512

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDZ

14737440.1